ACTIVE CASES Analysis August 2004 QA Results for Food Stamps

Sample Size: 88

(drops excluded)

Totals for August 2004:

LOCATION	TOTAL SAMPLE	# of ERROR	ERROR DOLLAR	PERCENT DOLLARS	FFY 2004 ERROR
	ISSUANCE	CASES	TOTAL	IN ERROR	RATE
STATEWIDE	18,457.00	11	1205.00	6.5%	6.8%
MILWAUKEE	9,486.00	6	645.00	6.8%	8.9%
BAL- STATE	8,971.00	5	560.00	6.2%	4.7%

ERROR CAUSES BY TYPE:

- **7-** Agency Preventable Errors
- 2- Client Errors
- 1- Agency
- 1-_CARES

OVERVIEW OF THE ERRORS AND WHERE THEY OCCURRED:

Of the 7 Agency Preventable Errors, 3 were in Milwaukee, and 4 were in the balance of state.

The two Client Reporting Errors were in Milwaukee.

TYPES OF APE ERRORS (7):

Regular Earned Income (5):

- Agency failed to correctly calculate earned income projection from the information provided (2)-
- Agency failed to re-verify at review (2)
- Agency failed to act on reported change that job ended

Self-Employment (1):

- Agency calculated Self Employment income from a partnership as regular earnings
- Ineligible Student (1):
- Agency included person who was a full time student, who didn't meet any of the other criteria for FS group inclusion.

TYPES of CLIENT ERRORS (2):

Rent (1): client failed to report at review that their rent had increased

Earned Income (1): client failed to report a new job at FS application

AGENCY ERROR (1):

This error was primarily an agency earned income budgeting error, but was downgraded from Agency Preventable to Agency (no sanction pass-through)) because of some extenuating factors including a change in the client reporting threshold midway in the certification.

CARES Error (1):

This Milwaukee agency error was recorded as a CARES error because CARES did not budget the W2 payment to be received in August, in the August FS calculation. This probably could have been prevented by the agency worker if they received an alert to run SFED. However because two agencies are responsible for one case-- W2 agency and county FS—it is more error-prone because of additional interagency communications needed. Thus we are categorizing these as "CARES errors."

WHEN WERE THE AGENCY PREVENTABLE ERRORS MADE?

Of 7 Agency Preventable Errors, 3 were made at application, 3 were made at review, and 1 was made at reported change.

WHEN WERE THE CLIENT ERRORS MADE?

Both client errors were made at reviews.

TRENDS OR RECOMMENDATIONS:

 Location: There was nothing disproportionate between Milwaukee and balance of state as far as Agency Preventable Errors. All client reporting errors were in Milwaukee, which may indicate a need to interview more purposefully; however two incidents is too few to draw any conclusions that the worker could have prevented it.

Earned Income: this definitely appears to be the ongoing primary issue with agency errors. Six cases of the nine were earned income errors, plus a seventh case was failure to recognize income as self-employment rather than regular earnings.

<u>BIGGEST CONTRIBUTORS</u>": The cases that caused the largest dollar errors for August 2004 (including client errors):

Milwaukee County, \$321 Agency Preventable Error:

This error occurred because the agency worker budgeted the weekly hours as biweekly. The employer stated the person works an average of 37.5 hours a week and is paid biweekly. The agency ESS budgeted 37.5 hours biweekly, meaning only half as much was budgeted as actually earned. Further the worker, at FS Application left a \$350 childcare expense from 1999 in the budget. This case error would likely have prevented if the worker had sent this case to Find and Fix upon completion of the review as directed by the State and Milwaukee County. This was not done.

Richland County, \$178 Agency Preventable Error:

This error occurred because the agency budgeted self-employment income as regular income. The employer verification form the agency received shows this person is in a three-person partnership. The 2003 tax form should have been used to estimate future income.

Rock County, \$163 Agency Preventable Error:

The error occurred because the agency used double the hours actually worked, which showed on the pay stubs. Also, tips were actually budgeted twice. They were included in the gross on the pay stubs, and were also listed in a separate place on the pay stubs, and the worker entered them both.